

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2006.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2006, Claims 57, 58, 63, 64, 72, 73, 81, 82 and 90-95 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 57, 63, 72 and 81 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 11 and 21 of co-pending Application No. 11/171,104. Claims 57, 63, 72, and 81 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie) in view of Gai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,445, hereinafter Gai). Claims 58, 64, 73 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Brownlie and Gai system further in view of Luckenbaugh (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,877). Claims 91, 93 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Brownlie, Gai and Luckenbaugh system as applied to claims 90, 92 and 94, and further in view of Balassanian (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,685).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 57, 58, 63, 64, 72, 73, 81 and 82, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 57, 58, 63, 64, 72, 73, 81, 82 and 90-95. Reconsideration of the Application and of the claims is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. §101 Double Patenting

In the Office Action mailed May 26, 2006, Claims 57, 63, 72 and 81 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 11 and 21 of co-pending Application No. 11/171,104. The present Response hereby amends Claims 57, 63, 72 and 81. Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claims 57, 63, 72 and 81 do not claim the same invention as Claims 1, 11 and 21 of co-pending Application 11/171,104 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed May 26, 2006, Claims 57, 63, 72, and 81 were rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie) in view of Gai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,445, hereinafter Gai). Claims 58, 64, 73 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Brownlie and Gai system further in view of Luckenbaugh (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,877). Claims 91, 93 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Brownlie, Gai and Luckenbaugh system as applied to claims 90, 92 and 94, and further in view of Balassanian (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,685).

Claim 57

Claim 57 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 57 now defines:

57. *A system for maintaining security in a distributed computing environment, comprising:*
a policy manager located on a server for creating a local security policy and for distributing the local security policy to a client wherein the local security policy includes a plurality of rules customized to the client, said plurality of rules including a set of grant rules that allow access to securable components and a set of deny rules that prevent access to said securable components; and
an application guard located at the client for managing access by individual transactions to securable components at a client level as specified by the local security policy, the securable components including at least one application;
wherein the policy manager receives a global security policy that includes a plurality of rules for regulating access to said securable components and wherein the policy manager customizes the local security policy by selecting a subset of rules from the global security policy that are applicable to the application guard and distributes the subset to the application guard; and
wherein the application guard receives an authorization request including a subject, an object and a privilege and evaluates said request by matching the subset of rules received from the policy manager to said subject, said object and said privilege in order to control access to said securable components.

As amended, Claim 57 defines a policy manager located on a server for creating a local security policy and distributing the local security policy to a client. The local security policy includes a plurality of rules including grant rules for allowing access to securable components (e.g. applications) and deny rules for preventing access to such components. The local security is created by receiving a global security policy and selecting a subset of rules from the global policy that are applicable to the application guard. The application guard then controls access to securable components by receiving authorization requests and evaluating them against the local

security policy (subset of rules). Such an authorization request includes a subject, an object and a privilege and the application guard matches them to the subset of rules that it has received in order to control access to the securable components.

The advantages of the features in Claim 57 is the ability to distribute security policies that control access to the various applications, functions, etc. at the client level. Thus, a more sophisticated security policy is possible because the application can evaluate access privileges during every transaction (Specification page 10).

Brownlie teaches computer network security system and method having unilateral enforceable security policy provision. More particularly, Brownlie appears to disclose a centrally assigned policy data such as password length rules that is unilaterally enforced at network nodes (Brownlie, Abstract). Gai, on the other hand, appears to teach high level quality of service policies and global and local scope policies (col. 18, lines 24-35). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Brownlie in combination with Gai fail to disclose the features of Claim 57.

For example, Brownlie and Gai fail to disclose distributing grant and deny rules that control access to securable components, as defined in Claim 57. Instead, Brownlie appears to disclose that policy parameters are distributed to network nodes. These policy parameters include policies relating to password aging, password reuse, length of password, lifetime rules related to certificates and renewals, etc. (col. 3, lines 25-49). They do not appear to be grant and deny rules that *control* access by individual transactions to an application or other securable components, as defined in Claim 57.

Furthermore, Brownlie and Gai fail to disclose an application guard that receives an authorization request including a subject, an object and a privilege and evaluates that request by matching them to the subset of the rules received via the distribution, as defined in Claim 57. Neither Brownlie nor Gai does not appear to be concerned with evaluating authorization decisions, nor subjects, objects or privileges, as defined in Claim 57.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 57, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 63, 72 and 81

Claims 63, 72 and 81 have been amended similarly to Claim 57 to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 63, 72 and 81 as amended, are

likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 58, 64, 73, 82 and 90-95

Claims 58, 64, 73, 82 and 90-95 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 58, 64, 73, 82 and 90-95 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned before an advisory action is issued in order to avoid any unnecessary filing of an appeal.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 24, 2006

By: _____

Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910